UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,799	12/08/2005	Tomonari Nakayama	03500.101486.	8177
	7590 12/03/200 CELLA HARPER &	EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFEL		JAHAN, BILKIS		
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commence	10/559,799	NAKAYAMA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	BILKIS JAHAN	2814					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from (6), cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 S</u>	Sentember 2008						
	s action is non-final.						
,	,_						
·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.							
·—	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
	r cicolion requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 December 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F	ate					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Uther:							

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mlica et al (Analytica Chimica Acta 354 (1997) 283-289). The copy of this paper (First page, pages 284-289) has been attached.

Regarding claim 1, Mlica et al disclose field effect transistor (Fig. 2, Abstract, line 3) comprising at least a substrate (Fig. 2a, element "silicon"), an organic semiconductor layer (Fig. 2a, element "epoxy encapsulation"), an insulating layer (Fig. 2a, element "calixarene", page 284, section 2.1.1), and a conductive layer (Fig. 2a, element "source"),

 Mlica et al do not disclose the insulating layer comprises a cured product of a phenol resin represented by a following general formula (I):

(wherein, R1, R2 and R3 are each independently at least one selected from the

group consisting of hydrogen atom, halogen atom, hydroxymethyl group, alkyl group having 1 to 12 carbon atoms, alkenyl group, alkinyl group, alkoxyl group, alkylthio group, and alkyl ester group, XI and X2 are each independently at least one selected from the group consisting of hydrogen atom, alkyl group having 1 to carbon atoms, alkenyl group, alkinyl group, and aryl group, and n is an integer of 0 to 2,000.). However, when the semiconductor compound recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

Regarding claim 2, Mlica et al discloses the field effect transistor the conductive layer comprises a gate electrode (Fig. 2a, element "Gate"), a source electrode (Fig. 2a, element "Source"), and a drain electrode (Fig. 2a, element "drain"), the insulating layer includes a gate insulating layer, and the gate insulating layer (Fig. 2a, element "calixarene", page 284, section 2.1.1) is a cured product of a phenol resin represented by the above general formula (I).

Regarding claim 3, Mlica et al fails to disclose the field effect transistor, wherein the thickness of the gate insulating layer is 100 nm to 1 Dm. However, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any suitable thickness for the device, because it has been held that where the general conditions of the claims are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable range by routine experimentation. See In re Alner, 220 F .2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mlica et al (Analytica Chimica Acta 354 (1997) 283-289) in view of Tsutsui (US 7,239,081 B2).

Regarding claim 4, Mlica in view of Bernds et al disclose limitations in claim 1 but do not disclose the field effect transistor wherein part or all of the conducive layer comprises an agglomerate of conductive fine particles.

- However, Tsutsui discloses part or all of the conductive layer comprises an
 agglomerate of conductive fine particles 104 (Tsutsui, col.5, lines 39-40). Tsutsui
 teaches conductive particles in the film are used for high conductivity (col. 2,
 lines 38-41). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill of the art at
 the time of invention to replace Mlica's conductive film with Tsutsui's conductive
 film for high conductivity (col. 2, lines 38-41).
- Bernds et al do not disclose a primary particle diameter of 5 nm to 2 micrometer.
 However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any suitable diameter for the device, because it has been held that where the general conditions of the claims are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to

discover the optimum or workable range by routine experimentation. See In re Alner, 220 F .2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Claims 5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mlica et al (Analytica Chimica Acta 354 (1997) 283-289) in view of Henshaw et al (3857817).

Regarding claim 5, Mlica et al disclose a process for producing a field effect transistor (Fig. 2, Abstract, line 3) comprising at least a substrate (Fig. 2a, element "silicon"), an organic semiconductor layer (Fig. 2a, element "epoxy encapsulation"), an insulating layer (Fig. 2a, element "calixarene", page 284, section 2.1.1), and a conductive layer (Fig. 2a, element "source"),

- Mlica et al do not disclose coating a thermosetting resin. However, Henshaw et al show the usage of hexamethoxymethyl as a thermosetting coating (abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill of art at the time of invention to add Bernds's process with Henshaw's usage.
- However, Mlica et al do not disclose a thermosetting resin the insulating layer composition containing at least a phenol resin represented by the following general formula (I):

Application/Control Number: 10/559,799

Art Unit: 2814

(wherein, RI, R2 and R3 are each independently at least one selected from the group consisting of hydrogen atom, halogen atom, hydroxymethyl group, alkyl group having 1 to 12 carbon atoms, alkenyl group, alkinyl group, alkoxyl group, alkylthio group, and alkyl ester group, X1 and X2 are each independently at least one selected from the group consisting of hydrogen atom, alkyl group having 1 to carbon atoms, alkenyl group, alkinyl group, and aryl group, and n is an integer of 0 to 2,000.) and heating it to form the insulating layer. However, when the semiconductor compound recited in the reference is substantially identical to that

Page 6

Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent.

Regarding claim 7, Mlica et al disclose limitations in claim 5 but do not disclose process for producing a field effect transistor, wherein the softening point of the phenol resin contained in the thermosetting resin composition is in the range of 70 to 130°C.

However, Henshaw et al disclose the softening point of the phenol resin contained in the thermosetting resin composition is in the range of 70 to 130°C (column 3, lines 58-60). Hanshaw teaches thermosetting resin composition is in the range of 70 to 130°C is used for achieving excellent hardness, toughness and durability of the film (col.1, line 15). It would have

Application/Control Number: 10/559,799

Art Unit: 2814

been obvious to one having ordinary skill of the art at the time of invention to replace Mlica's process temperature with Hanshaw's process temperature for achieving excellent hardness, toughness and durability of the film (col.1, line 15).

Page 7

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mlica et al (Analytica Chimica Acta 354 (1997) 283-289), Henshaw et al (3857817) and further in view of Hirai (US 2004/0129937 A1).

Regarding claim 6, Mlica et al disclose limitations in claim 5 but do not disclose process for producing a field effect transistor, wherein part or all of the conductive layer is formed by applying a solution, dispersion, or paste of a conductive material or a precursor of the Conductive material and heating it.

• However, Hirai discloses part or all of the conductive layer is formed by applying a solution, dispersion, or paste of a conductive material (Para. 77, 78) or a precursor of the Conductive material and heating it. Hirai teaches using wet process to increase productivity and reducing cost (Para. 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill of the art at the time of invention to replace Mlica's process with Hirai's process to increase productivity and reducing cost (Para. 5).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BILKIS JAHAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5022. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (571)-272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Wai-Sing Louie/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2814

Page 8